

INTERVIEW RECORD FOR SECOND FIVE-YEAR REVIEW

November 2001 through November 2006

Type 2 Interview – Regulatory/Advisory Agency

Operable Units A and B-1, and Petroleum Sites

Former Adak Naval Complex

Adak, Alaska

Individual Contacted: ADEC-FFERP (Roberts, Halverson, Weigle)

Title:

Organization: Alaska Department of Environmental Conservation

Contact Telephone: 907-269-7528

Contact E-mail: jason_weigle@dec.state.ak.us

**Address: 555 Cordova St., Second Floor
Anchorage, AK 99502**

Questionnaire delivered by: JoAnn Grady

Response type: E-mail

Date:

Summary of Communication

1. Do you feel well informed about site activities at OU A, OU B-1, or the petroleum sites?

Response: Yes.

2. To the best of your knowledge, since November 2001 have there been any new scientific findings that relate to potential site risks and that might call into question the protectiveness of the remedies for OU A, OU B-1, or the petroleum sites? Have there been any changes to the ARARs upon which the remedy decision was based?

Response: Numerous ARARs have changed since the Records of Decision for OU A and OU B-1 were signed. The five-year review should include evaluating whether any of these revisions indicate the existing remedies may no longer be protective (at this point we have not completed such an analysis). Currently institutional controls (ICs) prohibit use of groundwater as a drinking water source and limit excavation of soils at sites with known residual contamination. Changes in chemical specific ARARs related to these sites do not impact protectiveness as long as the ICs remain in place. Prior to institutional controls being removed, remaining contamination levels will need to be compared to existing ARARs to ensure long term protectiveness if unrestricted future land use is desired.

3. Are you aware of any changes in site conditions that you feel may impact the protectiveness of the remedies selected in the RODs (interim ROD [1995], final OU A ROD [2000], and final OU B-1 [2001])?

Response: The City of Adak is using the SA 76 site as a refuse collection and transfer station. Current land use does not affect the protectiveness of the remedy. However, if the industrial/commercial make-up of Adak should change, the transfer station could present a possible source of contamination at the site.

4. Since November 2001, have there been any complaints, violations, or other incidents related to OU A, OU B-1, or the petroleum sites that required a response by your office? If so, please provide details of the events and results of the responses.

Response: There have been several incidents related to ordnance items from OU B-1 and OU B-2. The majority of the incidents involved items from OU B-2. However, an incident occurred early in 2005 as the City was dredging the small boat harbor. Several ordnance related items were discovered by the dredging crew. The Navy and the Department held a meeting with City of Adak staff to discuss the situation. The Department has not heard anything since this meeting regarding the disposition of these items by the City and/or the Navy.

The vegetation on the landfill caps at Roberts and White Alice landfills is not growing in places. Vegetation on the landfills is a requirement of the state issued permits for both of these landfills. The Navy undertook a revegetation remedial action in the summer of 2005 to rectify this situation.

Sampling work conducted by the USGS in 2003 revealed a previously unknown petroleum plume located between the GCI building and the Eagle Housing section of SWMU 62, known as Area 303. The Navy has begun the process of investigating the site to determine what actions may be necessary.

5. Are you aware of any community concerns regarding implementation of the remedies at OU A, OU B-1, or the petroleum sites? If so, please give details.

Response: Residents of the community are consistently concerned about the remedies at Palisades and Metals Landfills. The concern at Palisades is the unsightly nature of the metals remaining in the Palisades Creek gorge. The other concern regards the metal barrel retaining wall located to the north of and separate from Metals landfill. Neither currently represents an imminent threat to human health and the environment. If

conditions should change, these sites will be reevaluated to determine what, if any, actions need to occur.

6. Do you have any suggestions regarding implementation of the remedies (including institutional controls)? If so, please give details.

Response: The Ordnance Awareness program needs to do a better job of reaching out to transient visitors to the island. Currently the program does a fairly successful job of reaching residents, although there is some indication that newer residents are still unaware of problems. Stakeholders on the island, USFWS, TAC, City of Adak, residents, guides, and the Navy, need to work together to come up with a creative solution to this issue. The Navy is actively pursuing ways to effectively reach this target audience; however, a multi-faceted team approach will probably be necessary to effectively reach transient visitors to the island.

7. Do you have any suggestions for changes in how monitoring of the remedies is being conducted?

Response: None. The Navy has effectively monitored remedies and reported the results in a timely manner.

8. Do you have any other comments, concerns, or suggestions regarding the effectiveness of the cleanup measures implemented so far in protecting human health and the environment at OU A, OU B-1, or the petroleum sites at the former Adak Naval Complex?

Response: The Department is concerned about how the remedy in the OU B-1 ROD has been implemented on sections of Mt. Moffett. Because the remedy has not been fully implemented, we cannot concur that it is protective at this time for these sites. Discussions amongst the three FFA parties are continuing regarding this matter.

The Department is also concerned about the protectiveness of remedies applied at several OU B-1 sites. Several sites were transferred without activity restrictions, even though site conditions may have warranted additional land use controls. These sites include the Heart Lake complex and C3-01A amongst others.

INTERVIEW RECORD FOR SECOND FIVE-YEAR REVIEW

November 2001 through November 2006

Type 1 Interview – Navy Personnel

Operable Units A and B-1, and Petroleum Sites

Former Adak Naval Complex

Adak, Alaska

Individual Contacted: Jim Brown

Title: Remedial Project Manager

Organization: NAVFAC Northwest

Telephone: 360.396.0082

E-mail: jim.r.brown@navy.mil

Address: 19917 7th Ave NE, Poulsbo, WA 98370

Contact made by: JoAnn Grady

Response type: E-mail

Date: 25 August 2005

Summary of Communication

1. Since completion of the first 5-year review in November 2001, are you aware of any changes in land uses, public access, or other site conditions that you feel may impact the protectiveness of the remedies selected in the RODs (interim ROD [1995], final OU A ROD [2000], and final OU B-1 [2001])?

Response: No

2. Are you aware of concerns from the local community regarding implementation or overall environmental protectiveness of the selected remedies for OU A, OU B-1, and the petroleum sites?

Response: No

3. Has there continued to be a regular program of on-site inspection and operation, maintenance, and monitoring (OMM) since November 2001?

Response: Yes

4. Have there been any unexpected difficulties associated with OMM since November 2001?

Response: No

5. Have there been any substantial changes to inspection and OMM requirements or activities? If so, do you feel that these changes have impacted the protectiveness of the remedies selected in the RODs?

Response: No

6. Are you aware of any violations of the institutional controls requirements at any of the OUs that could impact the protectiveness of this component of the remedy (e.g., unauthorized excavation or drilling of water supply wells)?

Response: Since IC inspections began in 2002, there have been a few deficiencies noted along with recommendations for corrective action. The corrective actions include minor fence and gate repairs at landfills, signage repair or replacement, development and distribution of additional IC educational material, and repair of the vegetative cap at two landfills. To date, all corrective measures have been implemented.

7. What measures have been taken to implement institutional controls required by the RODs?

Response: When the property was transferred to TAC, land use restrictions and excavation prohibitions were included in the Interim Conveyance. The land use restrictions and excavation prohibitions “run with the land” and are binding on all subsequent owners. In addition, an institutional control management plan (ICMP) has been prepared to ensure the reliability and effectiveness of the institutional controls as required by the OU A and OU B-1 RODs. On an annual basis, the Navy monitors, inspects and documents the effectiveness of the ICs in accordance with the procedures of the ICMP.

8. Do you have any other comments, concerns, or suggestions regarding the effectiveness of the cleanup measures implemented so far in protecting human health and the environment at OU A, OU B-1, or the petroleum sites at the former Adak Naval Complex?

Response: No

INTERVIEW RECORD FOR SECOND FIVE-YEAR REVIEW

November 2001 through November 2006

Type 3 Interview – Community Member

Operable Units A and B-1, and Petroleum Sites

Former Adak Naval Complex

Adak, Alaska

Individual Contacted: Felicity Flensburg

Title: Secretary

Organization: City of Adak

Telephone: 907 592 4500

E-mail:

Address:

Contact made by: JoAnn Grady

Response type: Interview

Date: September 19, 2005

Summary of Communication

1. Do you feel well informed about the environmental cleanup activities and progress for OU A, OU B-1, and the petroleum sites at the former Adak Naval Complex, since the first 5-year review conducted in November 2001?

Response: Yes, there is always information about the cleanup activities readily available.

2. What is your overall impression of the on-going environmental cleanup activities at OU A, OU B-1, and the petroleum sites especially since November 2001?

Response: Everyone involved seems to be consistent in the clean up efforts.

3. What effects on the community have you observed as a result of on-going remedy implementation, especially since November 2001?

Response: The community seems to be interested in the environmental clean-up more because of the information that is available to them.

4. Are you aware of any community concerns regarding implementation of the remedies? If so, please give details.

Response: no.

5. Since November 2001, are you aware of any events, incidents, or activities (e.g., vandalism, trespassing, or emergency response) related to OU A, OU B-1, or the petroleum sites? If so, please provide details of the events and results of the responses.

Response: There have been many that I've heard of, mainly because of signage that has deteriorated or broken fences etc.

6. Do you have any other comments, concerns, or suggestions regarding the effectiveness of the cleanup measures implemented so far in protecting human health and the environment at OU A, OU B-1, or the petroleum sites at the former Adak Naval Complex?

Response: I hope it gets done correctly and efficiently.

7. Are you satisfied with the level and quality of information provided to the RAB through RAB meetings, associated presentations, and by way of the Adakupdate website?

Response: yes

INTERVIEW RECORD FOR SECOND FIVE-YEAR REVIEW

November 2001 through November 2006

Type 3 Interview – Community Member

Operable Units A and B-1, and Petroleum Sites

Former Adak Naval Complex

Adak, Alaska

Individual Contacted: Mary Grisco

Title: volunteer

Organization: Sierra Club

Telephone: 907-258-1896

E-mail: megrisco@ak.net

Address: PO Box 202045, Anchorage, AK 99520

Contact made by: JoAnn Grady

Response type:

Date: September 20, 2005

Summary of Communication

1. Do you feel well informed about the environmental cleanup activities and progress for OU A, OU B-1, and the petroleum sites at the former Adak Naval Complex, since the first 5-year review conducted in November 2001?

Response: reasonably; still need info in context, that is map and details within the whole planning area and connected to other activities

2. What is your overall impression of the on-going environmental cleanup activities at OU A, OU B-1, and the petroleum sites especially since November 2001?

Response: getting better because people keep asking for specifics and clarity

3. What effects on the community have you observed as a result of on-going remedy implementation, especially since November 2001?

Response: community is forming; challenge is for folks there to understand the long term implications of decisions and not just be concerned about seasonal work

4. Are you aware of any community concerns regarding implementation of the remedies? If so, please give details.

Response: Continuing concerns about landfills and petroleum products; concerns about monitoring (need active updates to community, etc.)

5. Since November 2001, are you aware of any events, incidents, or activities (e.g., vandalism, trespassing, or emergency response) related to OU A, OU B-1, or the petroleum sites? If so, please provide details of the events and results of the responses.

Response: no

6. Do you have any other comments, concerns, or suggestions regarding the effectiveness of the cleanup measures implemented so far in protecting human health and the environment at OU A, OU B-1, or the petroleum sites at the former Adak Naval Complex?

Response: need clarity about relation to human health in terms that everyday folks understand. The ‘parts per million’ and “CDC/FDA/EPA standards” don’t answer whether or not children can play in an area, fish can be eaten regularly, etc. People can make reasonable decisions if given decent information.

7. Are you satisfied with the level and quality of information provided to the RAB through RAB meetings, associated presentations, and by way of the Adakupdate website?

Response: Presentations can be skimpy at times – particularly when there’s no maps, handouts, etc. provided while speaker is talking. Quality needs to be translated into terms everyday folks can understand. Presentations need to be connected to the whole – the whole area, the whole clean-up effort (from start to whenever) and to land ownership. Presentations need to be tied to monitoring or whatever management control is in place or being proposed.

INTERVIEW RECORD FOR SECOND FIVE-YEAR REVIEW

November 2001 through November 2006

Type 3 Interview – Community Member

Operable Units A and B-1, and Petroleum Sites

Former Adak Naval Complex

Adak, Alaska

Individual Contacted: Steve Hines

Title: City Manager

Organization: City of Adak

Telephone: 907-592-4500

E-mail: shirokuma9@aol.com

Address: PO Box 2011, Adak AK, 99546

Contact made by: JoAnn Grady

Response type: Interview

Date: September 19, 2005

Summary of Communication

1. Do you feel well informed about the environmental cleanup activities and progress for OU A, OU B-1, and the petroleum sites at the former Adak Naval Complex, since the first 5-year review conducted in November 2001?

Response: Yes

2. What is your overall impression of the on-going environmental cleanup activities at OU A, OU B-1, and the petroleum sites especially since November 2001?

Response: Time lines and dedication to complete UXO clean-up has been lacking.

3. What effects on the community have you observed as a result of on-going remedy implementation, especially since November 2001?

Response: No negative effects.

4. Are you aware of any community concerns regarding implementation of the remedies? If so, please give details.

Response: Yes, the clean-up of the area around metals landfill near Sandcove Housing. There is a safety concern with these old, sharp pieces of metal sticking out of the ground.

5. Since November 2001, are you aware of any events, incidents, or activities (e.g., vandalism, trespassing, or emergency response) related to OU A, OU B-1, or the petroleum sites? If so, please provide details of the events and results of the responses.

Response: One “Trespasser” into parcel 4. This was addressed and corrected.

6. Do you have any other comments, concerns, or suggestions regarding the effectiveness of the cleanup measures implemented so far in protecting human health and the environment at OU A, OU B-1, or the petroleum sites at the former Adak Naval Complex?

Response: None

7. Are you satisfied with the level and quality of information provided to the RAB through RAB meetings, associated presentations, and by way of the Adakupdate website?

Response: Yes

INTERVIEW RECORD FOR SECOND FIVE-YEAR REVIEW

November 2001 through November 2006

Type 4 Interview – Land Owner

Operable Units A and B-1, and Petroleum Sites

Former Adak Naval Complex

Adak, Alaska

Individual Contacted: David Jensen

Title: CEO

Organization: The Aleut Corporation

Telephone: 907 561 4300

E-mail: djensen@aleutcorp.com

Address: 4000 Old Seward Hwy.

Anchorage AK 99503

Contact made by: Heather Boge

Response type: E-mail

Date:

Summary of Communication

1. Do you feel well informed about the environmental cleanup activities and progress for OU A, OU B-1, and the petroleum sites at the former Adak Naval Complex, since the first 5-year review conducted in November 2001?

Response: yes

2. What is your overall impression of the on-going environmental cleanup activities at OU A, OU B-1, and the petroleum sites especially since November 2001?

Response: We are concerned about human health. The work scheduled for remedial work in the area of south runway 18/36 is important and should continue. Any other sites where free product recovery is possible should be active sites.

3. Are you aware of any changes in site conditions that you feel may impact the protectiveness of the remedies selected in the RODs (interim ROD [1995], final OU A ROD [2000], and final OU B-1 [2001])?

Response: none reported

4. Do you have any suggestions regarding implementation and monitoring of the remedies (including institutional controls)? If so, please give details.

Response: none

5. Are you aware of any community concerns regarding implementation of the remedies? If so, please give details.

Response: none

6. Since November 2001, are you aware of any events, incidents, or activities (e.g., vandalism, trespassing, or emergency response) related to OU A, OU B-1, or the petroleum sites? If so, please provide details of the events and results of the responses.

Response: no

7. Do you have any other comments, concerns, or suggestions regarding the effectiveness of the cleanup measures implemented so far in protecting human health and the environment at OU A, OU B-1, or the petroleum sites at the former Adak Naval Complex?

Response: thank You

INTERVIEW RECORD FOR SECOND FIVE-YEAR REVIEW

November 2001 through November 2006

Type 3 Interview – Community Member

Operable Units A and B-1, and Petroleum Sites

Former Adak Naval Complex

Adak, Alaska

Individual Contacted: Charles E Lyon

Title: Power Plant Operator

Organization: City of Adak

Telephone: 907-592-8175

E-mail: Charles_Lyon@msn.com

Address: P.O. Box 2097, Adak, Alaska, 99546

Contact made by:

Response type:

Date:

Summary of Communication

1. Do you feel well informed about the environmental cleanup activities and progress for OU A, OU B-1, and the petroleum sites at the former Adak Naval Complex, since the first 5-year review conducted in November 2001?

Response: I haven't been contacted prior to this questionnaire but the information is available here on Adak for review.

2. What is your overall impression of the on-going environmental cleanup activities at OU A, OU B-1, and the petroleum sites especially since November 2001?

Response: I am not familiar with the clean-up of those areas, so I cannot answer fairly.

3. What effects on the community have you observed as a result of on-going remedy implementation, especially since November 2001?

Response: Very little.

4. Are you aware of any community concerns regarding implementation of the remedies? If so, please give details.

Response: No

5. Since November 2001, are you aware of any events, incidents, or activities (e.g., vandalism, trespassing, or emergency response) related to OU A, OU B-1, or the petroleum sites? If so, please provide details of the events and results of the responses.

Response: I have heard reports of people violating the no trespassing signs and entering the restricted areas near Lake Andrew.

6. Do you have any other comments, concerns, or suggestions regarding the effectiveness of the cleanup measures implemented so far in protecting human health and the environment at OU A, OU B-1, or the petroleum sites at the former Adak Naval Complex?

Response: It appears to be going quite well. Hopefully more monies will become available to allow the continuation of the cleanup of the areas of concern here on Adak. We hear lots of rumors but sometimes it is difficult to get any hard information.

7. Are you satisfied with the level and quality of information provided to the RAB through RAB meetings, associated presentations, and by way of the Adakupdate website?

Response: The information is presented so thoroughly that it is difficult at times for the average citizen to wade through it all. Some of the reports should cut to the chase and make it clear to the common person what is being done as far as the clean-up is concerned and what the future looks like for getting the other areas of concern on Adak finished.

INTERVIEW RECORD FOR SECOND FIVE-YEAR REVIEW

November 2001 through November 2006

Type 3 Interview – Community Member

Operable Units A and B-1, and Petroleum Sites

Former Adak Naval Complex

Adak, Alaska

Individual Contacted: Mike Mitchell

Title: RAB member

Organization: RAB

Telephone: 907 269-5100

E-mail: mike_mitchell@law.state.ak.us

Address:

Contact made by: JoAnn Grady

Response type: Interview

Date: September 7, 2005

Summary of Communication

1. Do you feel well informed about the environmental cleanup activities and progress for OU A, OU B-1, and the petroleum sites at the former Adak Naval Complex, since the first 5-year review conducted in November 2001?

Response: Yes.

2. What is your overall impression of the on-going environmental cleanup activities at OU A, OU B-1, and the petroleum sites especially since November 2001?

Response: The Navy is doing a reasonably diligent job given resource constraints.

3. What effects on the community have you observed as a result of on-going remedy implementation, especially since November 2001?

Response: I cannot say I have observed any effects on Adak since I have not visited the island. I can infer that because on-island attendance of RAB's seems to be sporadic, there are likely not any major local issues.

4. Are you aware of any community concerns regarding implementation of the remedies? If so, please give details.

Response: No.

5. Since November 2001, are you aware of any events, incidents, or activities (e.g., vandalism, trespassing, or emergency response) related to OU A, OU B-1, or the petroleum sites? If so, please provide details of the events and results of the responses.

Response: No.

6. Do you have any other comments, concerns, or suggestions regarding the effectiveness of the cleanup measures implemented so far in protecting human health and the environment at OU A, OU B-1, or the petroleum sites at the former Adak Naval Complex?

Response: I would suggest that there be a report given specifically on this topic. I am not aware of any reports given lately to the RAB on how the cleanup measures that have been implemented have protected human health and the environment. It is an important topic and given that there has not been a recent report, I would suggest there should be one.

7. Are you satisfied with the level and quality of information provided to the RAB through RAB meetings, associated presentations, and by way of the Adakupdate website?

Response: Yes, generally I am satisfied with the level and quality of information provided.

INTERVIEW RECORD FOR SECOND FIVE-YEAR REVIEW

November 2001 through November 2006

Type 1 Interview – Navy Personnel

Operable Units A and B-1, and Petroleum Sites

Former Adak Naval Complex

Adak, Alaska

Individual Contacted: Mark S. Murphy

Title: Munitions Response Program Manager

Organization: NAVFAC Northwest

Telephone: (360) 396-0070

E-mail: mark.s.murphy1@navy.mil

Address: 19917 7th Ave. NE, Poulsbo, WA 98370

Contact made by: JoAnn Grady

Response type: E-mail

Date:

Summary of Communication

1. Since completion of the first 5-year review in November 2001, are you aware of any changes in land uses, public access, or other site conditions that you feel may impact the protectiveness of the remedies selected in the RODs (interim ROD [1995], final OU A ROD [2000], and final OU B-1 [2001])?

Response: Since November of 2001, the number of permanent resident on Adak Island has gone from more than 200 to significantly less than 100. The overwhelming majority of these residents are employed in support of the Adak fishery or as providers and administrators of services from the City of Adak. The result of this change in the population and economic base has, undoubtedly, lead to a reduction in the intensity of land use in remote areas of Adak Island.

2. Are you aware of concerns from the local community regarding implementation or overall environmental protectiveness of the selected remedies for OU A, OU B-1, and the petroleum sites?

Response: No. Local community input regarding the environmental restoration program has been solicited by the Navy and regulatory agencies at Restoration Advisory Board meetings. Public participation is encouraged. Since 2001, maintaining local participation in these meetings has become more difficult. While there are, no doubt, more than one reason for this, it is reasonable to believe that at least part of the reason it has become more difficult to maintain public interest is that the local

community is not concerned about the protectiveness of selected remedies.

3. Has there continued to be a regular program of on-site inspection and operation, maintenance, and monitoring (OMM) since November 2001?

Response: Yes

4. Have there been any unexpected difficulties associated with OMM since November 2001?

Response: None that I am aware of.

5. Have there been any substantial changes to inspection and OMM requirements or activities? If so, do you feel that these changes have impacted the protectiveness of the remedies selected in the RODs?

Response: No.

6. Are you aware of any violations of the institutional controls requirements at any of the OUs that could impact the protectiveness of this component of the remedy (e.g., unauthorized excavation or drilling of water supply wells)?

Response: I am aware of an incident of transient employees of Adak fishery violating access restrictions that exist at the Andrew Lake (Parcel 4) area. In instance, these individuals retrieved a variety of ordnance (MEC) scrap items, presumably for souvenir value, and brought these items into the City of Adak area. While none of these items presented an explosive safety hazard, the incident illustrated the need for improving access barriers and emphasizing the need for on island residents and visitors to heed access restrictions. The Navy has since taken action to address these needs.

While these ICs are not technically part of the OU remedies required by the OU A or OU B-1 RoD, they illustrate corrective actions taken to improve the effectiveness of ICs.

7. What measures have been taken to implement institutional controls required by the RODs?

Response: See response above. Navy has provided fact sheets on a regular basis to provide updated information on ICs. In addition, the Navy maintains a complete inventory of ordnance education and awareness information (hiking maps, DVDs, brochures, posters, etc.) on Adak Island. These materials are provided on request by Charles Long (City of Adak employee). Additional hiking maps and other educational

materials are maintained at USF&W's seasonal office on Adak. These materials are provided with Special Use Permits for Adak Island which are issued by USF&W to guides who may be engaged in commercial recreational use of refuge and non-refuge lands on Adak Island.

8. Do you have any other comments, concerns, or suggestions regarding the effectiveness of the cleanup measures implemented so far in protecting human health and the environment at OU A, OU B-1, or the petroleum sites at the former Adak Naval Complex?

Response: None

INTERVIEW RECORD FOR SECOND FIVE-YEAR REVIEW

November 2001 through November 2006

Type 2 Interview – Regulatory/Advisory Agency

Operable Units A and B-1, and Petroleum Sites

Former Adak Naval Complex

Adak, Alaska

Individual Contacted: Kevin Oates

Title: USEPA Remedial Project Manager

Organization: USEPA Region 10

Telephone: 334-270-3427

E-mail: oates.kevin@epa.gov

Address: 540 S. Morris Ave. Montgomery, AL 36067

Contact made by: JoAnn Grady

Response type: E-mail

Date: Sept 7, 2005

Summary of Communication

1. Do you feel well informed about site activities at OU A, OU B-1, or the petroleum sites?

Response: Yes

2. To the best of your knowledge, since November 2001 have there been any new scientific findings that relate to potential site risks and that might call into question the protectiveness of the remedies for OU A, OU B-1, or the petroleum sites? Have there been any changes to the ARARs upon which the remedy decision was based?

Response: There have been no changes to chemical-specific ARARs for OUA or OUB-1. Not all of the remedial actions selected in the OUB-1 ROD have been completed at this time. Specifically, 360 acres on Mt. Moffett have not had a clearance to 4 feet bgs as selected by the ROD. The Navy, EPA, and ADEC are currently discussing alternative approaches for this area.

3. Are you aware of any changes in site conditions that you feel may impact the protectiveness of the remedies selected in the RODs (interim ROD [1995], final OU A ROD [2000], and final OU B-1 [2001])?

Response: Maintaining the cap at Metals landfill has been a challenge due to severe winter storms. The Navy has made all necessary repairs

from such storms. The change in land ownership in 2004 does not appear to have any impact on the selected remedies.

4. Since November 2001, have there been any complaints, violations, or other incidents related to OU A, OU B-1, or the petroleum sites that required a response by your office? If so, please provide details of the events and results of the responses.

Response: There have been two known incidents of island personnel and/or workers bring munitions, or munitions related items into the downtown area. These were addressed by the navy and did not require action by EPA.

5. Are you aware of any community concerns regarding implementation of the remedies at OU A, OU B-1, or the petroleum sites? If so, please give details.

Response: No, not at this time.

6. Do you have any suggestions regarding implementation of the remedies (including institutional controls)? If so, please give details.

Response: Yes, it would be beneficial for the Navy to make completion of OUB1 and OUB2 work a higher priority at Adak. There has been a substantial investment to date by the Navy, as well as from EPA, ADEC, USFWS and others to get Adak to its current state of cleanup. It would be great to see this work completed in the next few years.

7. Do you have any suggestions for changes in how monitoring of the remedies is being conducted?

Response: No.

8. Do you have any other comments, concerns, or suggestions regarding the effectiveness of the cleanup measures implemented so far in protecting human health and the environment at OU A, OU B-1, or the petroleum sites at the former Adak Naval Complex?

Response: No.

INTERVIEW RECORD FOR SECOND FIVE-YEAR REVIEW

November 2001 through November 2006

Type 3 Interview – Community Member

Operable Units A and B-1, and Petroleum Sites

Former Adak Naval Complex

Adak, Alaska

Individual Contacted: Violet Pearl

Title: Co-chair

Organization: Adak RAB

Telephone: 907 592 2332

E-mail:

Address: Box 1954, Adak Ak 99546

Contact made by: JoAnn Grady

Response type: Verbal interview

Date: August 4, 2005

Summary of Communication

1. Do you feel well informed about the environmental cleanup activities and progress for OU A, OU B-1, and the petroleum sites at the former Adak Naval Complex, since the first 5-year review conducted in November 2001?

Response:

Yes I do because I am directly in contact with Mark Wicklein and JoAnn Grady.

2. What is your overall impression of the on-going environmental cleanup activities at OU A, OU B-1, and the petroleum sites especially since November 2001?

Response:

When Mark Murphy, Mark Wicklein and Jason Weigle were on island it helped understand the technical aspect of the process tremendously. When the Navy actually makes a site visit it help to bring the remediation to a more understandable level. I can't explain much of anything to others on island if I don't have the technical support to explain.

3. What effects on the community have you observed as a result of on-going remedy implementation, especially since November 2001?

Response:

The island has not changed much since the transfer and there still are questions regarding the remediation but the questioning is not as negative as before. I attribute this to on-site visits by the Navy and the regulatory agencies.

The e mails are not helpful in explaining what is going on technically.

4. Are you aware of any community concerns regarding implementation of the remedies? If so, please give details.

Response:

No

5. Since November 2001, are you aware of any events, incidents, or activities (e.g., vandalism, trespassing, or emergency response) related to OU A, OU B-1, or the petroleum sites? If so, please provide details of the events and results of the responses.

Response:

None that I know of regarding the petroleum sites. But there are incidents with UXO sites. Local residents and visitors both feel free to pick up ordnance. They know better but do it anyway. The sign is up but it doesn't stop them.

In one incident, someone picked up the UXO, put it in the back of his truck and drove it through town. The response was quick and the UXO was picked up and the [problem was dealt with by a local citizen.

6. Do you have any other comments, concerns, or suggestions regarding the effectiveness of the cleanup measures implemented so far in protecting human health and the environment at OU A, OU B-1, or the petroleum sites at the former Adak Naval Complex?

Response:

I think site visits to Adak are important because it helps people understand how important the remediation issues are.

7. Are you satisfied with the level and quality of information provided to the RAB through RAB meetings, associated presentations, and by way of the Adakupdate website?

Response:

If folks can afford the internet service then Adakupdate is relative. Otherwise, they rely on phone calls or mail service to update them on information.

RAB meetings help a lot.

INTERVIEW RECORD FOR SECOND FIVE-YEAR REVIEW

November 2001 through November 2006

Type 3 Interview – Community Member

Operable Units A and B-1, and Petroleum Sites

Former Adak Naval Complex

Adak, Alaska

Individual Contacted: Christopher M. Riggio, PE
Title: Federal Sites Restoration Coordinator
Staff Civil/Environmental Engineer
Organization: Aleutian Pribilof Islands Association, Inc.
(APIA)
Telephone: (907) 222-4219
E-mail: chrisr@apiai.org
Address: 201 East 3rd Avenue
Anchorage, Alaska 99501

Contact made by: JoAnn Grady
Response type: via E-Mail
Date: September 6, 2005

Summary of Communication

1. Do you feel well informed about the environmental cleanup activities and progress for OU A, OU B-1, and the petroleum sites at the former Adak Naval Complex, since the first 5-year review conducted in November 2001?

Response: Yes. Plenty of information has been made available to me from mail, flyers, and e-mail updates, and also from my attendance at various project team and RAB meetings. I could not attend all of the project team and RAB meetings due to funding limitations, but was able to attend many to most during 2001-2004. Thanks to some funding from the U.S. Navy, APIA was able to participate in much of the process.

2. What is your overall impression of the on-going environmental cleanup activities at OU A, OU B-1, and the petroleum sites especially since November 2001?

Response: Overall impression is good. I am concerned about funding limitations resulting in cuts or limits to sufficient completion of the environmental cleanup activities. It seems there are still a few loose ends remaining and areas of some conflict between the agencies involved in the process. But I am generally satisfied with most of the work completed and with the efforts made by all parties to ensure public safety and the health of people and the environment.

3. What effects on the community have you observed as a result of on-going remedy implementation, especially since November 2001?

Response: I have only visited the community once, in 2001, and only for a couple of days. I have interacted with some members of the community on other projects and because of my role with the Aleut tribes and other residents of the Aleutian/Pribilof Region. My impression is that the effects of on-going remedy implementation have had positive results in the community, are generally appreciated by community members, and will result in greater potential for viable re-use of the facilities and the island. I am sure that residents of Adak will enjoy a better quality of life thanks to implementation of remedies, and that the health and safety of people, wildlife, and the environment are much improved. I hope that remedy implementation, follow-up, and follow-through will continue and not be ignored or forgotten by the U.S. Navy and U.S. government.

4. Are you aware of any community concerns regarding implementation of the remedies? If so, please give details.

Response: I have heard some community concerns regarding lack of cleanup of debris and hazardous debris left behind by the U.S. Navy. I understand that the government has some limitations/restrictions regarding the cleanup of debris. However, some community members have mentioned that they are disappointed that the Navy has not found a way to address these issues completely. Although the Navy did address many areas of hazardous debris, there are still several that remain.

5. Since November 2001, are you aware of any events, incidents, or activities (e.g., vandalism, trespassing, or emergency response) related to OU A, OU B-1, or the petroleum sites? If so, please provide details of the events and results of the responses.

Response: I did hear a story about some community member that picked up several UXO items from a restricted beach area and brought them into the community in the back of his pickup truck, and that many in the community were very angry with him and that he should have known better. I don't have much specific information regarding the exact dates of this episode, but I believe it was some time in 2003. I believe the issue was resolved and don't recall if charges were filed against this individual. I heard this information from Cathy Villa who can be reached at 907-271-5083 (USEPA) or 907-250-3550 (cell).

6. Do you have any other comments, concerns, or suggestions regarding the effectiveness of the cleanup measures implemented so far in protecting human health and the environment at OU A, OU B-1, or the petroleum sites at the former Adak Naval Complex?

Response: None, other than those stated above (regarding follow-through on implemented remedies, as well as long-term monitoring).

7. Are you satisfied with the level and quality of information provided to the RAB through RAB meetings, associated presentations, and by way of the Adakupdate website?

Response: Yes, very satisfied with the level and quality of information. The ADAKUPDATE website is very well organized. Many of the presentations and newsletters that I saw had much material presented in clear, understandable, and, where appropriate, layperson terms that I believe truly helped provide information to the community and public in a way that most could understand. I think it is important and vital that agencies continue to make such efforts to get information out to folks through various different media and methods. Such include on-site meetings, flyers, website updates, on-site library, etc. Public involvement needs to be tailored to each community and overall, I believe the U.S. Navy and other involved agencies did a good job here, minus a few bumps in the road along the way.

INTERVIEW RECORD FOR SECOND FIVE-YEAR REVIEW

November 2001 through November 2006

Type 4 Interview – Land Owner

Operable Units A and B-1, and Petroleum Sites

Former Adak Naval Complex

Adak, Alaska

Individual Contacted: Ron Stroman

Title: Senior Leasing Officer, Adak Project Acquisition Lead

Organization: St. of AK, Department of Transportation

Telephone: 907-269-0742

E-mail: ron_stroman@dot.state.ak.us

Address:

P.O. Box 196900

Anchorage, Alaska 99519

Contact made by: JoAnn Grady

Response type: E-mail

Date:

Summary of Communication

1. Do you feel well informed about the environmental cleanup activities and progress for OU A, OU B-1, and the petroleum sites at the former Adak Naval Complex, since the first 5-year review conducted in November 2001?

Response: The Navy and the Ak Dept of Environmental Conservation has kept the Department of Transportation informed of what actions are being taken by the Navy and ADEC and the results of it's on-going remedial efforts. Having been brought into this effort in the middle of the Navy's clean up efforts, their willingness to keep the department informed is much appreciated.

2. What is your overall impression of the on-going environmental cleanup activities at OU A, OU B-1, and the petroleum sites especially since November 2001?

Response: The Department of Transportation's impression is that the Navy's clean up efforts are designed to meet commercial standards based upon human health risk standards. We appreciate the Navy's efforts but find that the residual contamination remaining in the ground along with its accompanying institutional controls/equitable servitude will place a heavier burden on the State should an airport improvement project take place.

3. Are you aware of any changes in site conditions that you feel may impact the protectiveness of the remedies selected in the RODs (interim ROD [1995], final OU A ROD [2000], and final OU B-1 [2001])?

Response: None at this time. However, the State may have airport improvement projects in the future that will have an effect on site conditions.

4. Do you have any suggestions regarding implementation and monitoring of the remedies (including institutional controls)? If so, please give details.

Response: There needs to be written procedures and process, with time frames, for when the land is disturbed through a State airport improvement project. Right now there has only been verbal discussions/agreement on what needs to be done and what process needs to be followed.

As a sidebar, because the Adak airport is certificated under FAR Part 139, the Navy must contact the department for clearance whenever it's work takes it into the active airport lands.

5. Are you aware of any community concerns regarding implementation of the remedies? If so, please give details.

Response: None.

6. Since November 2001, are you aware of any events, incidents, or activities (e.g., vandalism, trespassing, or emergency response) related to OU A, OU B-1, or the petroleum sites? If so, please provide details of the events and results of the responses.

Response: None

7. Do you have any other comments, concerns, or suggestions regarding the effectiveness of the cleanup measures implemented so far in protecting human health and the environment at OU A, OU B-1, or the petroleum sites at the former Adak Naval Complex?

Response: The Department acknowledges the Navy's responsibility in regards the environmental contamination, and appreciates its' on-going efforts to remediate the sites, we do disagree with the level of contamination that is being allowed to remain in the soils (particular area of concern is the tanker shed). We look forward to our continued working relationship.

INTERVIEW RECORD FOR SECOND FIVE-YEAR REVIEW

November 2001 through November 2006

Type 2 Interview – Regulatory/Advisory Agency

Operable Units A and B-1, and Petroleum Sites

Former Adak Naval Complex

Adak, Alaska

Individual Contacted: Kent Sundseth

Title: Refuge Operations Specialist

**Organization: U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service – Alaska Maritime National
Wildlife Refuge**

Telephone: 907 235-6546

E-mail: kent_sundseth@fws.gov

**Address: 95 Sterling Highway Suite 1
Homer, AK 99603**

Contact made by: JoAnn Grady

Response type: E-mail

Date: September 16, 2005

Summary of Communication

1. Do you feel well informed about site activities at OU A, OU B-1, or the petroleum sites?

Response:

The Alaska Maritime National Wildlife Refuge (Refuge) has been well informed regarding issues related to OU A, the petroleum sites, and in most instances related to OU B-1. However, in December 2004, the Navy provided a draft OU B-1 ROD amendment to the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and Alaska Department of Environmental Conservation (ADEC) without sending this information to the Refuge. This document pertains to sites which are to be returned to the Refuge in the future and it seems appropriate to include the Refuge in this distribution. A copy of the OUB-1 ROD amendment document was forwarded to us by ADEC. It is our opinion that all members of the OUB-1 Project Team should receive this information directly.

2. To the best of your knowledge, since November 2001 have there been any new scientific findings that relate to potential site risks and that might call into question the protectiveness of the remedies for OU A, OU B-1, or the petroleum sites? Have there been any changes to the ARARs upon which the remedy decision was based?

Response:

We are not aware of new findings relative to site risks that question the effectiveness of remedial action for OU A, OU B-1 or the petroleum sites. There have been changes to ARAR/TBC's for three OU B-1 sites which are now included in Parcel 4 because these sites are to return to the Refuge in the future.

3. Are you aware of any changes in site conditions that you feel may impact the protectiveness of the remedies selected in the RODs (interim ROD [1995], final OU A ROD [2000], and final OU B-1 [2001])?

Response:

We are not aware of any changes on the actual sites which could affect the protectiveness selected in the ROD's.

4. Since November 2001, have there been any complaints, violations, or other incidents related to OU A, OU B-1, or the petroleum sites that required a response by your office? If so, please provide details of the events and results of the responses.

Response:

The Refuge has had no complaints, violations or incidents relative to OU A, OU B-1 or petroleum sites which required a response from our office.

5. Are you aware of any community concerns regarding implementation of the remedies at OU A, OU B-1, or the petroleum sites? If so, please give details.

Response:

Refuge staff members have heard concern from community members regarding remedial actions for petroleum and PCB contamination in the Sweeper Creek drainage. The boom which stretches across the mouth of the creek is often unattached and appears to be minimally effective at capturing sheen in the water. Community members have stated they would not eat fish from Sweeper Creek or Sweeper Cove due to contaminants they feel are still present.

6. Do you have any suggestions regarding implementation of the remedies (including institutional controls)? If so, please give details.

Response:

Institutional controls for OU B include the production of a hiking trail map which provides information on ordnance awareness. These maps are frequently requested by visitors and are a valuable source of information for individuals who are hiking over large areas of Adak Island in search of caribou or a wilderness experience. These maps have been difficult to obtain in the quantity needed. The maps should be produced in greater quantity to ensure availability.

7. Do you have any suggestions for changes in how monitoring of the remedies is being conducted?

Response:

We have no suggestions concerning monitoring methodology.

8. Do you have any other comments, concerns, or suggestions regarding the effectiveness of the cleanup measures implemented so far in protecting human health and the environment at OU A, OU B-1, or the petroleum sites at the former Adak Naval Complex?

Response:

The Refuge feels the cleanup of OU A, the petroleum sites and most of OU B-1 has been adequate. However, we do have concerns about the OU B-1 ROD Amendment sites referenced earlier.

The proposal to modify the selected remedy for Amendment sites from subsurface clearance to technology aided visual surface clearance (TAVSC) is of particular concern. The draft ROD Amendment uses the change in reasonably expected future land use from unrestricted land use to a National Wildlife Refuge as justification for a new remedy. The ROD Amendment implies that returning jurisdiction of these areas to the Service would restrict the manner in which they will be used in the future. This fails to accurately characterize how National Wildlife Refuge Lands are administered in Alaska.

There are several important issues to recognize prior to considering modifications to the existing clearance methods for the Amendment sites. National Wildlife Refuges are managed not only for wildlife, but for wildlife-dependent human uses. Activities such as hunting, fishing, wildlife observation, wildlife photography, and environmental education and interpretation are provided for by the National Wildlife Refuge Improvement Act of 1997. The Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act (ANILCA) of 1980 clearly sets a standard of open access to the public for the purposes of outdoor recreation and the harvest of fish and wildlife that are a significant departure from refuges established outside Alaska.

As the ROD Amendment suggests, resource dependent activities of the nature described above have been limited in the Amendment area in the known past. However, this may largely be a result of restricted access to the area. The fact that the area is known to contain ordnance, uses institutional controls, and is featured in ordnance awareness materials most likely deters individuals who would otherwise be interested in using the area. If the Amendment areas were to undergo the same subsurface clearance completed in other OUB-1 sites, public use would certainly increase.

While returning jurisdiction of the Amendment sites to the Refuge would provide for public use, it would also open the area for possible selection and transfer to Native Corporations. The proposed use of TAVSC in the Amendment sites would result in “known” ordnance being left in place. The Refuge cannot accept lands that could not be transferred in the future because the area contains uninvestigated ordnance.

Considering the types of activities provided for by ANILCA and the National Wildlife Refuge Improvement Act of 1997, it is difficult to accept an abrupt departure from the subsurface clearance methodology used in all other OUB-1 areas simply because the future land use description has changed. If the clearance protocol deployed on all other OUB-1 areas provides for open access to the public without the need for additional institutional controls, then it seems entirely appropriate to continue this direction for the Amendment sites.

It is important to remember the Amendment sites were part of the Aleutian Islands Unit of the Alaska Maritime National Wildlife Refuge prior to the Department of the Navy withdrawal as the Adak Naval Air Station. These lands need to return to the refuge without the need for site specific institutional controls that are contrary to public laws governing the use of public lands in Alaska. If cleanup measures for the Amendment sites are completed in a manner which doesn't allow the area to be managed with the same opportunity for public access as other refuge lands, we are comfortable with the Navy maintaining jurisdiction until it does. We request that the Navy takes these issues into consideration as it endeavors to resolve issues regarding the methodology used to clear the OU B-1 ROD Amendment sites of ordnance.

INTERVIEW RECORD FOR SECOND FIVE-YEAR REVIEW

November 2001 through November 2006

Type 3 Interview – Community Member

Operable Units A and B-1, and Petroleum Sites

Former Adak Naval Complex

Adak, Alaska

Individual Contacted: Cathy Villa

Title: Tribal Coordinator

Organization: US EPA

Telephone: 907-271-1270

E-mail: villa.catherine@epa.gov

Address: 222 W. 7th Ave. Anchorage

Contact made by: Joann Grady

Response type:

Date: 08/04/05

Summary of Communication

1. Do you feel well informed about the environmental cleanup activities and progress for OU A, OU B-1, and the petroleum sites at the former Adak Naval Complex, since the first 5-year review conducted in November 2001?

Response: no

2. What is your overall impression of the on-going environmental cleanup activities at OU A, OU B-1, and the petroleum sites especially since November 2001?

Response: The work is good, but slow.

3. What effects on the community have you observed as a result of on-going remedy implementation, especially since November 2001?

Response: None

4. Are you aware of any community concerns regarding implementation of the remedies? If so, please give details.

Response: UXO issues concern people and sometimes rumors erupt. Community concerns stated at meetings that the remediation is not complete. The Fish advisory still exists for Sweeper Cove.

5. Since November 2001, are you aware of any events, incidents, or activities (e.g., vandalism, trespassing, or emergency response) related to OU A, OU B-1, or the petroleum sites? If so, please provide details of the events and results of the responses.

Response: UXO transportation by community residents.

6. Do you have any other comments, concerns, or suggestions regarding the effectiveness of the cleanup measures implemented so far in protecting human health and the environment at OU A, OU B-1, or the petroleum sites at the former Adak Naval Complex?

Response: I am concerned about the ROD agreement not being followed.

7. Are you satisfied with the level and quality of information provided to the RAB through RAB meetings, associated presentations, and by way of the Adakupdate website?

Response: Usually

INTERVIEW RECORD FOR SECOND FIVE-YEAR REVIEW

November 2001 through November 2006

Type 1 Interview – Navy Personnel

Operable Units A and B-1, and Petroleum Sites

Former Adak Naval Complex

Adak, Alaska

Individual Contacted: Mark Wicklein

Title: Remedial Project Manager and Navy RAB Co-Chair

Organization: US Navy, NAVFAC Northwest

Telephone: (360) 396-0226

E-mail: mark.Wicklein@navy.mil

Address: 19917 7th Avenue N.E., Poulsbo, WA 98370

Contact made by: Joann Grady

Response type: E-mail

Date: 08/23/05

Summary of Communication

1. Since completion of the first 5-year review in November 2001, are you aware of any changes in land uses, public access, or other site conditions that you feel may impact the protectiveness of the remedies selected in the RODs (interim ROD [1995], final OU A ROD [2000], and final OU B-1 [2001])?

Response: Please see Response No. 6. Otherwise No.

2. Are you aware of concerns from the local community regarding implementation or overall environmental protectiveness of the selected remedies for OU A, OU B-1, and the petroleum sites?

Response: No.

3. Has there continued to be a regular program of on-site inspection and operation, maintenance, and monitoring (OMM) since November 2001?

Response: Yes.

4. Have there been any unexpected difficulties associated with OMM since November 2001?

Response: No.

5. Have there been any substantial changes to inspection and OMM requirements or activities? If so, do you feel that these changes have impacted the protectiveness of the remedies selected in the RODs?

Response: Additional monitoring began during the 2004 field season to address requirements in the “Decision Document For Petroleum Sites With No-Unacceptable Risk”, dated April 2005. These changes did not impact the protectiveness of the remedies in the RODs.

6. Are you aware of any violations of the institutional controls requirements at any of the OUs that could impact the protectiveness of this component of the remedy (e.g., unauthorized excavation or drilling of water supply wells)?

Response: A comment was made by the State of Alaska Department of Environmental Conservation (ADEC) during review of an annual institutional controls inspection. ADEC asked that repair of the Roberts and White Alice landfills be conducted. This work was completed during the FY05 field season.

7. What measures have been taken to implement institutional controls required by the RODs?

Response: The Navy maintains an institutional controls management plan (as part of the Comprehensive Monitoring Plan or CMP). This document is updated about every two years. In addition, annual institutional controls inspections (and a summary report) are completed.

8. Do you have any other comments, concerns, or suggestions regarding the effectiveness of the cleanup measures implemented so far in protecting human health and the environment at OU A, OU B-1, or the petroleum sites at the former Adak Naval Complex?

Response: No.